

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

•					
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/612,754	07/01/2003	Thomas W. Mower	14564.37.1	5557	
JOHN C. STRINGHAM WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY 1000 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East South Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84111			EXAMINER		
			SHEIKH, HUMERA N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•	•		06/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/612,754	MOWER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Humera N. Sheikh	1615	

	Humera N. Sheikh	1615						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 05 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final reject	on.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	iate extension fee lice action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complicting the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, 	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause					
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); otter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amendment	(PTOL_324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		Amendment	(1 10L-524).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile that status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12,20 and 23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 13-19, 21, 22.		ill be entered and an	explanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessared.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		1000.1					
13. Other:		HUMULA HUMERA N PRIMARY EX	SHEIKH CAMINER					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims as now amended introduce new limitations not previously presented during prosecution and thus, change the scope of the claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the "different characteristics of liquid and powdered extracts of Luo Han Guo" are not persuasive since the prior art also teaches inclusion of Luo Han Guo; thus, the properties and characteristics imparted by Luo Han Guo would be inherent therein. Moreover, a compound and its' properties are inseparable. Applicant's argument that "Su does not teach Luo Han Guo in an effective amount to mask flavor and/or scent of the noni-fruit" was not persuasive since 'an effective amount' is a relative limitation and does not set forth any degree of masking. Moreover, the secondary references provide for the use of Luo Han Guo as a sweetening agent.. Applicant's arguments that "Fischer and Downton are devoid of the teaching that liquid Luo Han Guo can be used to mask bad flavor and/or scent" was not persuasive since the art teaches the use of Luo Han Guo and the fact that Applicant recognizes another advantage which accrues from a particular component (i.e., Luo Han Guo) does not render the application patentable. "It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. >See, e.g., In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 987, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The preference of obtaining desired properties (i.e., sweetening; masking foul taste) by the Applicant based on a particular ingredient does not render a patentable distinction over the explicit reference teachings. Further, for the reasons advanced in the Final Office Action, Applicant's arguments were not found persuasive.